



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,421	03/25/2004	Henderikus H.N.J. Jorg	ASMINT.066AUS	8929
20995	7590	02/21/2006	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			FOX, JOHN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3753	
DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/810,421	JORG, HENDERIKUS H.N.J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John Fox	3753	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/20/06.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 26-42 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claims 26-42 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on February 2, 2006.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Bragt.

Van Bragt shows a glass multiway valve with a lower coaxial port leading to a process chamber and a plurality of other ports leading to tubes 18, 19, 20, 21.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Bragt.

The use of quartz glass in the valve of Van Bragt is considered an obvious matter of design choice in view of the well known nature of same.

Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Bragt in view of Geyer.

Art Unit: 3753

Van Bragt shows the claimed device except that the plug passages are formed interior to the plug. Geyer shows a similar valve with a passage 6 formed as a groove on the surface of the plug. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have made the Van Bragt passages as a surface groove in view of the readily apparent equivalence of the two constructions.

Claims 10 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Bragt in view of Mayhew.

Van Bragt shows the claimed device except for a cylindrical shape and bearing. Mayhew shows a rotary multiway valve of a cylindrical shape and Teflon bearings 32, 33. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used such a construction in place of the conical shape of Van Bragt to provide easier rotation, for example.

Claims 16-19 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Huska.

Huska shows a rotary valve with a passage 45 having a coaxial port and passage 41, which is read as a groove, connecting planar ports, which are read as including a bypass port. The sealing contact is read as being less than 0.02 mm in that such metal to metal surfaces generally form a seal.

Claims 17-19 are, in the alternative, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huska.

Providing a clearance of less than 0.02 mm in order to seal between the stator and rotor of Huska is considered an obvious matter of engineering design.

Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huska in view of Van Bragt.

Huska shows the claimed device except for the materials of manufacture. Van Bragt shows a glass body and a glass rotor for use in a laboratory. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used such a glass to make the valve of Huska to similarly provide for a valve that can be used in a laboratory.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Fox whose telephone number is 571-272-4912. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flextime.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keasel Eric can be reached on 571-272-4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



John Fox
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3753